



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,708	07/31/2003	Vantresa Stuckler	08049.0922	1594
7590 02/06/2009 Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P. 1300 I Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005-3315			EXAMINER FU, HAO	
			ART UNIT 3696	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/06/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/630,708

**Applicant(s)**

STICKLER, VANTRESA

**Examiner**

HAO FU

**Art Unit**

3696

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-92 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-92 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Remarks***

In the remarks, filed on 11/18/2008, the applicant argues that the examiner has not properly resolved the Graham factual inquires, and specifically argues that Wankmueller is directed to a system for conducting a financial transaction over a payment network and thus not in the same scope as the present invention. The examiner points out that the present claims, even as amended, does not limit the "payment coding" to the intended postage environment. Neither the preamble provides any clue of the intended use of the invention nor does the body of claims explicitly define the meaning of "payment coding". The present claims are so broad that they read on payment coding in other art areas, and the Wankmueller reference is just a demonstration of such. The applicant is advised to further limiting the claims, especially the metes and bounds of the term "payment coding".

The applicant amends claims 1, 10, 12-14, 24, 32, 35-37, 47, 56, 58-60, 70, 79, and 81-83. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, this action is made final.

After a closer review, the examiner believes that the Gilliam reference and Pintsov reference teach all the limitations of the present independent claims, as amended. We must first define the terms in the claims. According to paragraph 023 and 049 of the specification, "delivery payment coding" is used to facilitate the tracking of item, very much like a tracking number or transaction identity number that is commonly used by postal service entities. In addition to facilitating the tracking of item,

delivery payment coding may also identify the recipient and sender. Furthermore, the delivery payment coding indicates that a proper delivery fee has been paid to the delivery system operator. And according to paragraph 052, "verification data" seems to be any data which can authenticate the delivery payment code. The verification data may also be encoded.

Under the above definition, "printed information" which contains "franking impression" in Gilham is the same as "delivery payment coding", because the printed information contains destination information, which identifies the recipient of the mail item (see column 2, line 14-27), and Gilham also teaches embedding information identifying the sender of the mail item in the destination information and to capture this identification information at the same time that the destination address is read (see column 3, line 52-61). One of ordinary skill in the art would agree that the identity information of both sender and recipient can facilitate the tracking of item in a postal system. Furthermore, the printed information contains franking impression which includes a postage charge value for the mail (see column 5, line 33-39). As such, the "printed information", which contains "franking impression", teaches all the limitation of "delivery payment coding". As the name suggests, "authentication code" in Gilham is equivalent to encrypted verification data, because the authentication code verifies the authentication of the printed information or the delivery payment code (see column 4, line 20-39). The authentication code may be decrypted to yield the transaction identity number, and comparison of the transaction identity number stored in the remote center with the transaction identity number obtained from the encrypted authentication code

printed in the printed information enables the postage charge for the mail item to be verified (see column 1, line 39-62). Furthermore, Gilham teaches the authentication code is generated using an algorithm and is printed on the mail item as part of the destination information (see column 3, line 62 through column 4, line 39). Therefore, it is evident that the authentication code is part of the printed information, or in other words, Gilham teaches the verification data is configured to be included in a delivery payment coding.

The applicant amends all the independent claims by adding "receiving a request for the verification data included in the delivery payment coding". The specific placement of this feature in the independent claims results in a new interpretation of the claimed feature. After close examination of the meaning of the claims, the examiner concludes that the Gilham reference and the Pintsov reference teach this feature, and the Wankmueller reference is not needed. In the context of the independent claims, "receiving a request for the verification data included in the delivery payment coding" is nothing more than initiating a reading on the verification data or initiating the authentication process on the verification data. See column 1, line 53-62, and column 2, line 14-30, Gilham teaches when a mail item is received at a delivery system, the printed information is read by the electronic mail reader, and the authentication code or the verification code is located. Then the postal authority "requests" to decrypt the authentication code or verification code to retrieve the transaction identity number for comparative authentication. And as discussed earlier, Gilham teaches the verification data is configured to be included in a delivery payment coding. Putting all together,

Gilham teaches receiving a request for the verification data included in the delivery payment coding.

The examiner also realizes that Gilham also teaches transmitting verification data configured to be included in a delivery payment coding. See column 1, line 41-53, and column 16-38, Gilham discloses that a transaction identity number, which is the essential part of authentication code or the verification data, is transmitted from the remote resetting center to the postage meter. Also as discussed earlier, Gilham teaches the verification data is configured to be included in a delivery payment coding.

In a final note, none of the Official Notices cited in the previous office action was officially challenged. Therefore, the Official Notices are treated as admitted prior arts.

Therefore, the independent claims as amended can be rejected entirely based on Gilham. The Pintsov reference is a closely related reference, which all the obvious variations of the claimed features. In conclusion, the present claims are not in the condition of allowance.

### ***Claim Rejection – USC 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Based on Supreme Court precedent a method claim must (1) be tied to another statutory class of invention (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to

a different state or thing (see at least *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876)). A method claim that fails to meet one of the above requirements is not in compliance with the statutory requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101 for patent eligible subject matter. Here claims 1-23 fail to meet the above requirements since there is not a sufficient tie to another statutory class. In order to overcome this rejection, the applicant must disclose in the claim the apparatus which perform the claimed steps.

### ***Claim Rejection 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1-12, 17, 19, 22-35, 40, 42, 45-58, 63, 65, 68-81, 86, 88, 91, and 92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Number 5,774,554 to Gilham, in view of US Patent Number 6,385,504 to Pintsov et al.

As per claim 1, Gilham teaches a method for providing a verifiable delivery payment coding, comprising:

transmitting verification data configured to be included in a delivery payment coding (see column 1, line 41-53, and column 16-38, Gilham discloses that a transaction identity number, which is the essential part of authentication code or the verification data, is transmitted from the remote resetting center to the postage meter);

receiving an item in an item delivery system, the item comprising the delivery payment coding including the verification data (see column 4, line 20-25; "authentication code" is equivalent to encrypted form of verification data, because they have the same

Art Unit: 3696

function of verifying the authentication of the delivery payment coding; prior art discloses that the authentication data is printed on the mail item, see column 3, line 62-65); and

receiving a request for the verification data included in the delivery payment coding (in the context of the independent claims, this feature discloses nothing more than initiating a reading on the verification data or initiating the authentication process on the verification data; see column 1, line 53-62, and column 2, line 14-30, Gilham teaches when a mail item is received at a delivery system, the printed information is read by the electronic mail reader, and the authentication code or the verification code is located; then the postal authority "requests" to decrypt the authentication code or verification code to retrieve the transaction identity number for comparative authentication; and as discussed earlier, Gilham teaches the verification data is configured to be included in a delivery payment coding);

verifying the authenticity of the delivery payment coding using the verification data (see column 5, line 38-55; "printed information" contains "franking impression" which is equivalent to delivery payment coding, because they both indicate whether the delivery of mail has been paid for; "transaction identity number" is the decrypted verification data; prior art teaches verifying the authenticity by checking the transaction identity number against the transaction number from the database).

Pintsov teaches transmitting verification data configured to be included in a delivery payment coding (see column 10, line 33-39; "unique identifier" is equivalent to verification data", since both verification data and identifier are used to identify each unique transaction and provide verification of authenticity; see column 11, line 13-14, the mailing identification file further includes the total postage, and thus the "mailing identification file" is equivalent to delivery payment coding; Pintsov teaches the mailer device receives mailing identification data or delivery payment code from postal authority, and the unique identifier or the verification data is included in the mailing identification file; in another word, postal authority transmits delivery payment coding which includes verification data).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the reference to include transmitting verification data configured to be included in a delivery payment coding.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the reference in order to allow mailer to prepare the mail item with the verification data.

As per claim 2, Gilham teaches wherein the verification data included in the delivery payment coding is machine readable (see column 3, line 62-67, and column 4, line 1-19; "authentication code" is equivalent to encrypted verification data, because they have the same function, which is to verify the authentication of the delivery payment coding; prior art discloses that the authentication code is printed in bar code form, which is machine readable).

As per claim 3, Gilham teaches wherein the verification data included in the delivery payment coding is optically scanable (see column 3, line 62-67, and column 4,



line 1-19; "authentication code" is equivalent to encrypted verification data, because they have the same function, which is to verify the authentication of the delivery payment coding; prior art discloses that the authentication code is printed in bar code form, which is optically scannable).

As per claim 4, Gilham teaches wherein the verification data is included in the delivery payment coding using at least one of a bar code and a PLANET code (see column 3, line 62-67, and column 4, line 1-19; "authentication code" is equivalent to encrypted verification data, because they have the same function, which is to verify the authentication of the delivery payment coding; prior art discloses that the authentication code is printed in bar code form).

As per claim 5, Gilham teaches wherein the delivery payment coding is included in an address label (see column 1, line 50-52; as discussed earlier, "franking impression" is equivalent to delivery payment coding; address label is pasted on the mail item; therefore, it makes no difference whether the delivery pay coding is printed directly on the mail item or printed on the address label and later pasted on the mail item).

As per claim 6, Gilham teaches wherein the delivery payment coding includes a visual representation of a monetary value associated with the delivery payment coding (see column 5, line 33-37; prior art teaches "postage charge value" is printed on the mail item; it is safe to assume that the charge value is a visual representation of a monetary value).

As per claim 7, Gilham does not limit wherein the item delivery system comprises the United States Postal Service.

Pintsov teaches the item delivery system comprises the United States Postal Service (see column 3, line 39-51, Pintsov's and Gilham's invention are in the same endeavor, and Pintsov also teaches a method for providing a verifiable delivery payment coding; see column 1, line 25-35, Pintsov teaches the item delivery system comprises the United States Postal Service).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the reference to include the item delivery system comprises the United States Postal Service.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the reference in order to permit USPS to use the invention.

As per claim 8, Gilham teaches wherein the item comprises at least one of a mailpiece, a United States Postal Service Priority Mail package, a United States Postal Service Express Mail Package, a United States Postal Service Global Express Mail Package, and a United States Postal Service Global Express Guarantee Package (see column 1, line 39-62).

As per claim 9, Gilham teaches transmitting the verification data further comprises utilizing at least one of regular mail, email, internet, and an interactive voice response system (see column 5, line 16-28; transaction identity number is essentially the verification data prior to encryption).

As per claim 10, Gilham teaches transmitting the verification data further comprises communicating over a network (see column 5, line 16-28; transaction identity number is essentially the verification data prior to encryption).

As per claim 11, Gilham teaches wherein the verification data is provided in an encrypted format (see column 4, line 26-27; "authentication code" is equivalent to verification data as discussed earlier; it is apparent that the authentication code is in encrypted format, which requires decoding).

As per claim 12, Gilliam teaches receiving a payment for delivery of the item (it is inherent that a payment is received by the postal service entity for delivering an item).

As per claim 17, Gilham teaches wherein verifying the authenticity of the delivery payment coding further comprises:

- receiving the verification data from the delivery payment coding after the item has been received in the item delivery system (see column 4, line 20-25; "authentication code" is encrypted verification data as discussed earlier);

- comparing the verification data obtained from the delivery payment coding to a verification database (see column 5, line 28-50; prior art teaches "transaction identity number" is obtained from decoding the "authentication code", thus "transaction identity number" can be understood as decrypted verification data; prior art further teaches "the transaction identity number obtained from the code is checked against the transaction number form the database"); and

Examiner notes Gilham does not explicitly teach determining the validity of the verification data obtained from the delivery payment coding, however the prior art implies it (see column 5, line 47-52; prior art performs a comparison of the verification data obtained from encrypted code and from database; it is implied that the reason for doing this comparison is to determine the validity of the verification data).

Pintsov teaches determining the validity of the verification data (see column 5, line 13-16, "identifier" is equivalent to verification data).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the reference to include determining the validity of the verification data.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the reference in order to prevent fraud.

As per claim 19, Gilliam teaches verifying the authenticity of the delivery payment coding further comprises updating the verification database if it is determined that the

verification data is valid (see column 5, line 47-53). However, Gilliam does not explicitly teach the update indicates that the verification data has been used.

Pintsov teaches the update indicates that the verification data has been used (see abstract, column 3, line 39-55, "unique identifier" is equivalent to verification data; Pintsov further teaches "the carrier service may note this fact in the carrier records to prevent reuse of the unique identifier").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the reference to include the update indicates that the verification data has been used.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the reference in order to prevent reuse of the verification data.

As per claim 22, Gilham teaches wherein transmitting verification data further comprises providing the verification data to a user through a user device (see column 1, line 41-46, especially "remote center generates a new transaction identity number to a mail sender's postage meter"; "transaction identity number" is decrypted verification data as discussed on claim 1, and "mail sender's postage meter" is clearly a user device), the user device configured to produce the delivery payment coding including the verification data (see column 1, line 46-52; "franking impression" is delivery payment coding).

As per claim 23, Gilham teaches wherein the user device is located in at least one of a home, an office, a store, a retail center kiosk, and an office of an item delivery system operator (see column 1, line 41-52; it is implied that the user device or "mail sender's postage meter" is located in at least one of a home, an office, a store, a retail center kiosk, and an office of an item delivery system operator; one of these location always has a postage meter).

As per claim 24, Gilham teaches a system for providing a verifiable delivery payment coding, comprising:

- a component for transmitting verification data configured to be included in a delivery payment coding (see column 1, line 41-53, and column 16-38, Gilham discloses that a transaction identity number, which is the essential part of authentication code or the verification data, is transmitted from the remote resetting center to the postage meter);

- a component for receiving an item in an item delivery system, the item comprising the delivery payment coding including the verification data (see column 4, line 20-25; "authentication code" is equivalent to encrypted form of verification data, because they have the same function of verifying the authentication of the delivery payment coding; prior art discloses that the authentication data is printed on the mail item, see column 3, line 62-65); and

- a component for receiving a request for the verification data included in the delivery payment coding (in the context of the independent claims, this feature discloses nothing more than initiating a reading on the verification data or initiating the

Art Unit: 3696

authentication process on the verification data; see column 1, line 53-62, and column 2, line 14-30, Gilham teaches when a mail item is received at a delivery system, the printed information is read by the electronic mail reader, and the authentication code or the verification code is located; then the postal authority "requests" to decrypt the authentication code or verification code to retrieve the transaction identity number for comparative authentication; and as discussed earlier, Gilham teaches the verification data is configured to be included in a delivery payment coding);

a component for verifying the authenticity of the delivery payment coding using the verification data (see column 5, line 38-55; "printed information" contains "franking impression" which is equivalent to delivery payment coding, because they both indicate whether the delivery of mail has been paid for; "transaction identity number" is the decrypted verification data; prior art teaches verifying the authenticity by checking the transaction identity number against the transaction number from the database).

Pintsov teaches a component for transmitting verification data configured to be included in a delivery payment coding (see column 10, line 33-39; "unique identifier" is equivalent to verification data"; see column 11, line 13-14, the mailing identification file further includes the total postage, and thus the "mailing identification file" is equivalent to delivery payment coding; Pintsov teaches the mailer device receives mailing identification data or delivery payment code from postal authority, and the unique identifier or the verification data is included in the mailing identification file; in another word, postal authority transmits delivery payment coding which includes verification data).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the reference to include a component for transmitting verification data configured to be included in a delivery payment coding.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the reference in order to allow mailer to prepare the mail item with the verification data.

As per claim 47, Gilham teaches a computer-readable medium on which is stored a set of instructions for providing a verifiable delivery payment coding, which when executed perform stages comprising (see Fig 2 and 3, and column 2, line 28-46; prior art teaches a computer-readable medium storing a set of instruction to perform the claimed method):

transmitting verification data configured to be included in a delivery payment coding (see column 1, line 41-53, and column 16-38, Gilham discloses that a transaction identity number, which is the essential part of authentication code or the verification data, is transmitted from the remote resetting center to the postage meter);

receiving an item in an item delivery system, the item comprising the delivery payment coding including the verification data (see column 4, line 20-25; "authentication code" is equivalent to encrypted form of verification data, because they have the same function of verifying the authentication of the delivery payment coding; prior art discloses that the authentication data is printed on the mail item, see column 3, line 62-65); and

receiving a request for the verification data included in the delivery payment

coding (in the context of the independent claims, this feature discloses nothing more than initiating a reading on the verification data or initiating the authentication process on the verification data; see column 1, line 53-62, and column 2, line 14-30, Gilham teaches when a mail item is received at a delivery system, the printed information is read by the electronic mail reader, and the authentication code or the verification code is located; then the postal authority "requests" to decrypt the authentication code or verification code to retrieve the transaction identity number for comparative authentication; and as discussed earlier, Gilham teaches the verification data is configured to be included in a delivery payment coding);

verifying the authenticity of the delivery payment coding using the verification data included in the delivery payment coding (see column 5, line 38-55; "printed information" contains "franking impression" which is equivalent to delivery payment coding, because they both indicate whether the delivery of mail has been paid for; "transaction identity number" is the decrypted verification data; prior art teaches verifying the authenticity by checking the transaction identity number against the transaction number from the database).

Pintsov teaches transmitting verification data configured to be included in a delivery payment coding (see column 10, line 33-39; "unique identifier" is equivalent to verification data"; see column 11, line 13-14, the mailing identification file further includes the total postage, and thus the "mailing identification file" is equivalent to delivery payment coding; Pintsov teaches the mailer device receives mailing identification data or delivery payment code from postal authority, and the unique identifier or the verification data is included in the mailing identification file; in another word, postal authority transmits delivery payment coding which includes verification data).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the reference to include transmitting verification data configured to be included in a delivery payment coding.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the reference in order to allow mailer to prepare the mail item with the verification data.

As per claim 70, Gilham teaches a system for providing a verifiable delivery payment coding, comprising:

a means for transmitting verification data configured to be included in a delivery payment coding (see column 1, line 41-53, and column 16-38, Gilham discloses that a transaction identity number, which is the essential part of authentication code or the verification data, is transmitted from the remote resetting center to the postage meter);

a means for receiving an item in an item delivery system, the item comprising the delivery payment coding including the verification data (see column 4, line 20-25; "authentication code" is equivalent to encrypted form of verification data, because they have the same function of verifying the authentication of the delivery payment coding; prior art discloses that the authentication data is printed on the mail item, see column 3, line 62-65); and

a means for receiving a request for the verification data included in the delivery

payment coding (in the context of the independent claims, this feature discloses nothing more than initiating a reading on the verification data or initiating the authentication process on the verification data; see column 1, line 53-62, and column 2, line 14-30, Gilham teaches when a mail item is received at a delivery system, the printed information is read by the electronic mail reader, and the authentication code or the verification code is located; then the postal authority "requests" to decrypt the authentication code or verification code to retrieve the transaction identity number for comparative authentication; and as discussed earlier, Gilham teaches the verification data is configured to be included in a delivery payment coding);

a means for verifying the authenticity of the delivery payment coding using the verification data included in the delivery payment coding (see column 5, line 38-55; "printed information" contains "franking impression" which is equivalent to delivery payment coding, because they both indicate whether the delivery of mail has been paid for; "transaction identity number" is the decrypted verification data; prior art teaches verifying the authenticity by checking the transaction identity number against the transaction number from the database).

Pintsov teaches a means for transmitting verification data configured to be included in a delivery payment coding (see column 10, line 33-39; "unique identifier" is equivalent to verification data"; see column 11, line 13-14, the mailing identification file further includes the total postage, and thus the "mailing identification file" is equivalent to delivery payment coding; Pintsov teaches the mailer device receives mailing identification data or delivery payment code from postal authority, and the unique identifier or the verification data is included in the mailing identification file; in another word, postal authority transmits delivery payment coding which includes verification data).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the reference to include a means for transmitting verification data configured to be included in a delivery payment coding.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the reference in order to allow mailer to prepare the mail item with the verification data.

Claim 25, 48, and 71 are rejected for the same reason as claim 2.

Claim 26, 49, and 72 are rejected for the same reason as claim 3.

Claim 27, 50, and 73 are rejected for the same reason as claim 4.

Claim 28, 51, and 74 are rejected for the same reason as claim 5.

Claim 29, 52, and 75 are rejected for the same reason as claim 6.

Claim 30, 53, and 76 are rejected for the same reason as claim 7.

Claim 31, 54, and 77 are rejected for the same reason as claim 8.

Claim 32, 55, and 78 are rejected for the same reason as claim 9.

Claim 33, 56, and 79 are rejected for the same reason as claim 10.

Claim 34, 57, and 80 are rejected for the same reason as claim 11.

Claim 35, 58, and 81 are rejected for the same reason as claim 12.

Claim 40, 63, and 86 are rejected for the same reason as claim 17.

Claim 42, 65, and 88 are rejected for the same reason as claim 19.

Claim 45, 68, and 91 are rejected for the same reason as claim 22.

Claim 46, 69, and 92 are rejected for the same reason as claim 23.

Claim 13-16, 18, 20, 21, 39, 41, 43, 44, 59-62, 64, 66, 67, 82-85, 87, 89, and 90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Number 5,774,554 to Gilham, in view of US Patent Number 6,385,504 to Pintsov et al, and further in view of Official Notice.

As per claim 13, Gilham does not explicitly teach wherein at least one of receiving the request for the verification data included in the delivery payment coding and receiving the payment further comprises utilizing at least one of regular mail, e-mail, facsimile, internet, and an interactive voice response system.

Official Notice is taken that receiving request for data and payment utilizing at least one of regular mail, e-mail, facsimile, internet, and an interactive voice response system is old and well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the reference to include receiving request for data and payment utilizing at least one of regular mail, e-mail, facsimile, internet, and an interactive voice response system.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the reference in order to provide different method of requesting data and payment. Also, as discussed above, Gilham teaches the verification data is included in the delivery payment coding.

As per claim 14, Gilham does not explicitly teach wherein at least one of receiving the request for the verification data included in the delivery payment coding and receiving the payment further comprises communicating over a network.

Official Notice is taken that receiving request for data and payment comprises communicating over a network is old and well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the reference to include at least one of receiving the request for the verification data and receiving the payment further comprises communicating over a network.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the reference in order to allow request of data and payment over long distance. Also, as discussed above, Gilham teaches the verification data is included in the delivery payment coding.

As per claim 15, Gilham does not explicitly teach wherein receiving the payment comprises at least one of sending a bill, debiting a checking account, debiting a credit card account, debiting a debit card account, and receiving cash.

Official Notice is taken that receiving the payment comprises at least one of sending a bill, debiting a checking account, debiting a credit card account, debiting a debit card account, and receiving cash is old and well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the reference to include receiving the payment comprises at least one of sending a bill, debiting a checking account, debiting a credit card account, debiting a debit card account, and receiving cash.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the reference in order to provide payment option.

As per claim 16, Gilham teaches further comprising:  
delivering the item to a recipient (Gilham's invention relates to postal authority; it is inherent that postal authority delivers the item to the recipient);

Examiner notes however, Gilham does not teach confirming the item delivery using the verification data from the delivery payment coding.

Pintsov teaches using unique identifier, which is equivalent to verification data, to serve as a basis for track and trace capability of mail item.

Official Notice is taken that confirming the item delivery as part of the features of track and trace capability of mail item is old and well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the references to come up with confirming the item delivery using the verification data from the delivery payment coding.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the reference in order to provide item mailing status.

As per claim 18, Gilliam does not teach wherein verifying the authenticity of the delivery payment coding further comprises returning the item to a sender if it is determined that the verification data is invalid.



Official Notice is taken that returning the item to a sender if it is determined that the verification data is invalid is old and well known.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the reference to include returning the item to a sender if it is determined that the verification data is invalid.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the reference in order to improve customer service.

As per claim 20, Gilham does not teach wherein verifying the authenticity of the delivery payment coding further comprises updating the verification database if it is determined that the verification data is valid, the update indicating that the item is in route through the item delivery system to a recipient.

Official Notice is taken that the update indicating that the item is in route through the item delivery system to a recipient is old and well known in the art. UPS and FedEx both have this feature on their website where user can check the status of the mailed item. Pintsov also suggests track and trace capability, which generally include update indicating that the item is in route through the item delivery system to a recipient.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the reference to include update indicating that the item is in route through the item delivery system to a recipient.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the reference in order to provide item status to both user and carrier.

As per claim 21, Gilham does not teach wherein the verification data is configured to be invalid after a period of time has passed after the verification data was provided.

Official Notice is taken that making verification data or identifier invalid after a period of time is old and well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the reference to include verification data is configured to be invalid after a period of time has passed after the verification data was provided.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the reference in order to set time limit to the mailer for sending out the item.

Claim 36, 59, and 82 are rejected for the same reason as claim 13.

Claim 37, 60, and 83 are rejected for the same reason as claim 14.

Claim 38, 61, and 84 are rejected for the same reason as claim 15.

Claim 39, 62, and 85 are rejected for the same reason as claim 16.

Claim 41, 64, and 87 are rejected for the same reason as claim 18.

Claim 43, 66, and 89 are rejected for the same reason as claim 20.

Claim 44, 67, and 90 are rejected for the same reason as claim 21.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HAO FU whose telephone number is (571)270-3441. The examiner can normally be reached on **Mon-Fri/Mon-Thurs 7:30am-5:00pm**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dixon can be reached on (571) 272-6803. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/THOMAS A DIXON/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3696

Hao Fu  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3696

FEB-09

/Hao Fu/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3696